

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO | |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/521,151 | 01/13/2005 | Joachim Hasch | 03100152US | 9119 | |
| 7055 7590 09/14/2006 | | | EXAM | EXAMINER | |
| GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE | | | THOMAS, AL | EXANDER S | |
| RESTON, V | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| ŕ | | | 1772 | | |

DATE MAILED: 09/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| 1 | 1 |
|---|---|
| (| r |

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summan | 10/521,151 | HASCH ET AL. | | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | Alexander Thomas | 1772 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | | | | | | | |
| | · | | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowan | ce except for formal matters, pro | secution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw | n from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | • | | | | | |
| 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. | | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | election requirement. | | | | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | , | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) | | | | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/6/05. Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/6/05. Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/6/05. Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/6/05. | | | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/521,151 Page 2

Art Unit: 1772

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the meaning and scope of the term "MUF" on page 2 of the specification is not understood.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The meaning and scope of the term "nail plate" has not been set forth. What materials and structure are contemplated for this feature of the claimed board.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-3 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Thoma 2004/0101649 or Buyten 823,843 each in view of Sean et al 6,696,167. The primary references disclose the invention substantially as claimed, namely a board comprising a plurality of wood pieces which are disposed side by side and are bonded together in multiple layers; see Figure 1, [0020], and [0021] of Thoma.

Application/Control Number: 10/521,151

Page 3

Art Unit: 1772

and Figure 3 and lines 17-38 of Buyten. However, the references do not disclose the use of OSB pieces in their boards. The secondary reference discloses the equivalence of wood and OSB pieces in wood-based composites; see column 1, lines 16-19. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use OSB pieces in place of wood pieces in the articles of the primary references in view of the teaching of equivalence in the secondary reference. Concerning claim 3, any of the pieces that lie between two of the layers in the laminates of the primary references can be considered a nail plate. Concerning claim 6, the air in the spaces of the primary references' articles can be considered an insulating material. With respect to claims 7-10, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select any specific dimensions for the boards in the primary references depending on the specific end use of the article.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Thoma 2004/0101649 or Buyten 823,843 each in view of Sean et al 6,696,167 as applied to claims 1-3 and 5-10 above, and further in view of Ramadan et al 5,275,862. Ramadan et al disclose the use of an intermediate plastic layer in a wood laminate; see column 2, lines 43-52. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the laminates of the primary references with an intermediate plastic layer as taught by Ramadan et al in order to provide decorative properties to the laminate.

Application/Control Number: 10/521,151 Page 4

Art Unit: 1772

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Thomas whose telephone number is 571-272-1502. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-4:00 M-THUR.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALEXANDER S. THOMAS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Olegandy & Transce